

# TERRY M. HOWLEY

12.2007

Attn: Peter M. Poon (SPE)  
USPTO  
P.O. Box 1451  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1451



Re: Patent Application No. 10/615,762 [Sent via Certified Mail #7005 1160 0003 4375 0039]

Mr. Peter Poon,

I've repeatedly tried to start my business here in Michigan. Is it *this* hard? It is now apparent that one hand does not know what the other is doing and/or does not want to know! The document that you, Supervisory Patent Examiner of the USPTO, directed me to in the PAIR system was signed by Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the US Patent and Trademark Office Jon W. Dudas. Does anyone know anything about it, and more so, where is it? Copies are enclosed. Does it take a federal judge to find it? Back door deals are not acceptable...I'm sure for you or me.

There are ethics violations everywhere. Why? Policing the United States Patent and Trademark Office is not my job, but I will do so with a federal prosecutor if my documents are not found or re-issued. No abandonment. The Willey patent is irrelevant. My invention IS NOTHING LIKE this forty-seven (47?!) year old patent (see reference cited)! No more semantic verbiage especially where Kurt Rowan is concerned, since he has repeatedly stopped my patent being granted. Why? Taking over 4 1/2 years that took only 12-18 months on my first patent granted? Several *personal visits* to Alexandria, VA (seven to date) and still no patent? Unfair, unethical and unacceptable. The patent office has my complete and undivided attention. Do I have yours?

This is not rocket science. Or is it? One hand covers up for another or should I say back door deal? Withholding information critical to my global patents is an ethics violation. Patent attorneys John Swartz Sr., John McCulloch and all associates know this all too well. As my attorney, demanding 49% interest in, and/or assignment of, my patent(s)/tooling is conflict of interest.

Are the people in charge also corrupt? Harry L. Moetz, USPTO Director of the Office of Enrollment and Discipline, received the signed complaint against John Swartz Sr. and Associates. Nothing happened and still no patent. I do not want any partners.

No action now... then fine. If anything Wal-Mart will be my partner. All tooling will leave with me on the way to Wal-Mart corporate headquarters. I will argue about ownership when (and if) I ever come back to this state.

Federal lawsuit(s) for this district are going to be filed while en route to Wal-Mart's corporate offices.

NO MORE BACK DOOR DEALS!!!!!!

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Terry M. Howley".

Terry M. Howley

PS Firing Kurt C. Rowan for starters. Revoking all licenses in the USPTO of all attorneys involved. I have the list.

encl.

cc:	Jon W. Dudas (DIR), USPTO	Congressman Dale Kildee
	<del>Peter M. Poon (SEP), USPTO</del>	Governor Jennifer M. Granholm - State of Michigan
	Harry L. Moetz (OED), USPTO	Deputy Commissioner John J. Love P/DCPEP - USPTO
	Congressman Dave Camp	Deputy Commissioner Margaret A. (Peggy) Focarino P/DCPO - USPTO

ORG.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/615,762	HOWLEY, TERRY M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kurt Rowan	3643	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Kurt Rowan (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Terry Howley (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: \_\_\_\_\_

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 21

Identification of prior art discussed: Willey

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: \_\_\_\_\_

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


The examiner will write Mr Howley a claim patentable over the prior art and fax the claim for comment.

COPY

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Kurt Rowan  
 Examiner's signature, if required

What is  
This Document?  
AND Where is This  
Doc.?



# THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

TO ALL TO WHOM THESE PRESENTS SHALL COME

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office

August 19, 2004

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT ANNEXED HERETO IS A TRUE COPY FROM  
THE RECORDS OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK  
OFFICE OF THOSE PAPERS OF THE BELOW IDENTIFIED PATENT  
APPLICATION THAT MET THE REQUIREMENTS TO BE GRANTED A  
FILING DATE.

APPLICATION NUMBER: 10/615,762  
FILING DATE: July 09, 2003  
RELATED PCT APPLICATION NUMBER: PCT/US04/21904

COPY



Certified by

Jon W Dudas

Acting Under Secretary of Commerce  
for Intellectual Property  
and Acting Director of the U.S.  
Patent and Trademark Office